



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/871,176

05/31/2001

Andrew J.R. Smith

3499-120

9946

56678

7590

03/20/2008

LEE & HAYES, PLLC
421 W. RIVERSIDE AVE.
SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

SURVILLO, OLEG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2142

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/20/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/871,176	Applicant(s) SMITH ET AL.	
	Examiner OLEG SURVILLO	Art Unit 2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 October 2007 and 07 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 17-31, 33 and 34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 17-31, 33 and 34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 September 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/22/07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-15, 17-31, 33, and 34 remain pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 4, 12, 15, 18, 19, 21, 23, 26, and 34 are currently amended. Claims 16, 32, and 35-49 have been canceled. No new claims have been added.

It is being noted that status identifier of claim 15 shows "Original", wherein the claim is currently amended. Applicants are required to correct the status identifier of claim 15 in their next reply.

Response to Arguments

2. With regard to the Applicants' remarks filed on October 22, 2007 and January 7, 2008:

Regarding the priority benefit claim, Applicants' amendment to cancel the benefit claim from the specification has been fully considered and is sufficient.

Regarding drawing objections, Applicants' amendment of the specification to obviate first ground of objection and Applicants' arguments to obviate third ground of objection have been fully considered and are persuasive. However, Applicants did not address second ground of objection, therefore, the objection to Fig. 3 is maintained.

Regarding objection to the specification, Applicants' amendment has been fully considered and is sufficient. Therefore, the objection has been withdrawn.

Regarding objection to claim 26 for minor informalities, Applicants' amendment has been fully considered and is sufficient. Therefore, the objection has been withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1, 12, 16, and 21 as failing to provide sufficient antecedent basis in the claimed terminology, Applicants' amendments have been fully considered and are sufficient. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of claims 3, 4, 15, 18, 19, 23, and 34 as being indefinite, Applicants' amendments have been fully considered and are sufficient. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn.

Regarding double patenting rejection, the Terminal Disclaimer filed on January 7, 2008 has been fully considered and is sufficient. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis in view of Cohen and regarding the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis in view of Cohen and in further view of Arnold, Applicants amended claim 1 to recite subject matter from now-canceled claim 16.

As to now-amended claim 1, Applicants argued that: *"neither Arnold nor any of the cited references have been shown to teach or suggest "placing a state event in a client event queue" and subsequently "transmitting a client event derived from the state event" ... to a client". In particular, Applicants argued that: "Arnold has been shown to teach using queues to pass data back and forth between clients and server. Merely passing data via these queues, however, fails to teach or suggest deriving a second*

event from a first event that has been placed in a queue, and transmitting the second event to a client". This argument is not persuasive because the concept of "deriving a second event from a first event that has been placed in a queue" has not been clearly introduced in the claim. In particular, claim 1 lacks the specificity as to what "deriving a second event from a first event" is. As presently claimed: "transmitting a client event derived from at least the state event" is not deemed specific enough to render Applicants argument persuasive. Applicants are therefore advised to amend claim 1 to explicitly introduce the concept of "deriving" as a separate step in the claim body with sufficient details supported by the specification as to enable one of ordinary skill in the art realize the inventive concept of "deriving a client (second) event from the state (first) event" and its structural/functional interconnection with other elements in the claim.

As to claim 1, Applicants also argued that: *"Arnold fails to teach or suggest placing a state event in the client event queue associated with the respective client, the state event indicating the current state of the particular data object". Instead, Arnold merely describes that Arnold's clients and servers may communicate data via a queue"*. This argument is not persuasive because Applicants argued against references individually where the rejection is based on combinations of references. In particular, "transmitting the current state of the particular data object to the respective client" was taught by Lewis, as discussed in the last Office action, wherein "placing a state event in the client event queue associated with the respective client, the state event indicating the current state of the particular data object" would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of combined teachings of Lewis, Cohen, and Arnold, as

discussed in the last Office action. The main thrust of Arnold teaching is the concept of utilizing queues to transmit data from a server to clients, as described in Fig. 24, wherein the combination of Lewis, Cohen, and Arnold render the claim obvious.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character not mentioned in the description: (74) at Fig. 3.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 17 and 33 are objected to because of the following informalities: these claims appear to depend from now-canceled claims 16 and 32. Appropriate correction is

required to correctly identify claim 17 as dependent from claim 1 and claim 33 as dependent from claim 21.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 6, 8-10, 14, 19-21, 25, 26, 28-31, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis (US Patent 6,513,019 B2) in view of Cohen et al. (US 2004/0254921 A1) and in further view of Arnold et al. (US 2007/0078978 A1).

As to claims 1 and 21, Lewis shows a method and a system for processing information provided from at least one content provider [disparate systems and data sources] (col. 4, lines 55-57) about a state of a plurality of objects (col. 4, lines 57-59), the states being subject to periodic updates (col. 3, lines 22-25) [wherein a state of an object is interpreted as a time sensitive information related to an object], and for delivering formatted information indicating a current state of at least a portion of the plurality of objects (col. 4, lines 59-63) to a plurality of clients via a data communication network (col. 4, lines 63-65) in substantially real-time (col. 4, lines 50-53). Lewis shows:

receiving raw data objects on at least one raw data stream input (col. 4, lines 55-56; col. 8, lines 54, 58-59; col. 9, lines 39-41);

generating a formatted data object from a received raw data object (col. 4, lines 59-60; col. 8, lines 60-61; col. 9, lines 45-50);

storing a current state of the formatted data object in an object storage pool [a database] (col. 6, lines 39-41; col. 8, lines 61-65; col. 10, lines 10-14); and

broadcasting the current state of the formatted data object on a particular broadcast data stream (col. 4, lines 63-67; col. 6, lines 41-43; col. 8, lines 65-67; col. 9, lines 1-7; col. 9, lines 54-60).

Lewis also shows:

establishing communication sessions with a plurality of clients (col. 4, lines 63-65);

connecting to at least one broadcast data stream (col. 9, lines 60-67);

receiving on a connected broadcast data stream a current state for a specific data object [messages] (col. 9, lines 60-67; col. 10, lines 55-62); and

transmitting the current state of the specific data object to a set of clients from the plurality of clients (col. 8, lines 65-67; col. 9, lines 1-7).

Lewis does not show updating an object pool cache to reflect the current state of the specific data object. Lewis also does not show that wherein each connected client has a respective client event queue, the step of transmitting the current state of the specific data object to the set of clients comprises the steps of, for each respective client in the set of clients:

placing a state event in the client event queue associated with the respective client, the state event indicating the current state of the particular data object; and subsequently transmitting a client event derived from at least the state event in the client event queue to the respective client.

Cohen shows:

updating an object pool cache to reflect the current state of the specific data object [updating proxy cache so that the cache has a valid (current) copy of the resource requested by a client] (par. [0002], lines 28-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and system of Lewis by having an object pool cache that is getting updated to reflect the current state of the specific data object in order to reduce the load on the object storage pool serving data and information distribution requests by transmitting the current state of the specific data object to clients from an object pool cache that stores a copy of the current state of the requested data object.

Lewis in view of Cohen does not show that wherein each connected client has a respective client event queue, the step of transmitting the current state of the specific data object to the set of clients comprises the steps of, for each respective client in the set of clients:

placing a state event in the client event queue associated with the respective client, the state event indicating the current state of the particular data object; and subsequently transmitting a client event derived from at least the state event in the client event queue to the respective client.

Arnold shows:

a delivery manager [a client/server system (2400)] wherein each connected client having a respective client event queue [message queue (2430)] (par. [0157]);

placing [data] associated with the respective client in the client event queue associated with the respective client [sending data to clients (2410) using queue] (par. [0157]); and

subsequently transmitting [data from the queue] to the respective client (par. [0157]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and system of Lewis in view of Cohen by having each connected client having a respective client event queue, as taught by Arnold, placing a state event in the client event queue associated with the respective client, the state event indicating the current state of the particular data object, and subsequently transmitting a client event derived from the queued event to the respective client in order to effectively deliver message data to a particular client in case when the client is not able to receive messages at the sending speed of the server.

It is being noted that "a client event derived from at least the state event in the client event queue" is interpreted as "the state event retrieved from the queue" absent specific distinction of a client event from the state event, as discussed in the section: Response to Arguments under response to argument pertaining to the concept of "deriving".

As to claims 6 and 25, Lewis shows an offer processor comprising interface/transformation server (100) Fig. 4 configured to perform the step of determining an object type of the raw data object (col. 10, lines 34-42), and the step of applying a set of formatting rules to the received raw data object in accordance with the object type to generate the formatted data object (col. 10, lines 43-49; col. 6, lines 7-12).

As to claims 8 and 28, Lewis shows the step of determining an object type of the raw data object (col. 10, lines 34-42) and that the particular broadcast data stream is selected from a plurality of broadcast data streams according to the object type comprising listening for any messages of a type that is processed by one or more of the information servers (col. 10, lines 55-62).

As to claims 9 and 29, Lewis shows validating the contents of the raw data object (col. 10, lines 8-9; col. 17, lines 23-33) and upon a failed validation, preventing subsequent broadcast of the current state of the formatted data object data derived from the raw data object (col. 10, lines 62-67).

As to claims 10 and 30, Lewis shows that the raw data object comprises information related to a financial product offering (col. 4, lines 54-59).

As to claims 14 and 31, Lewis shows the step of, in response to a detection that a particular client has subscribed to a new broadcast data stream not in a set of connected broadcast data streams, connecting to the new broadcast data stream comprising allowing subscribers to designate the specific information that is to be derived from each type of incoming transaction (col. 6, lines 7-11) and selecting from the Message Bus only those messages that are of interest to the listening component (col. 10, lines 65-67) and wherein users can introduce new services by modifying rule sets (col. 15, lines 7-28).

As to claim 26, Lewis shows a processing database having object typing and formatting rules stored therein comprising a table of stored transaction types (col. 10, line 38; col. 9, lines 25-32).

As to claims 19 and 34, Lewis in view of Cohen shows all the elements except for monitoring the performance of communication with each connected client, and dynamically adjusting a rate at which the current state of the specific data object is transmitted to each respective client in response to the monitored performance.

Arnold shows monitoring the performance of communication with each connected client comprising measuring the roundtrip time for packet transmission (paragraph [0173], lines 7-10), and dynamically adjusting a rate at which the current state of the specific data object is transmitted to each respective client in response to the monitored performance (paragraph [0173], lines 4-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and system of Lewis in view of Cohen by monitoring the performance of communication with each connected client, and dynamically adjusting a rate at which the current state of the specific data object is transmitted to each respective client in response to the monitored performance in order to substantially optimize communications between a client and a server (paragraph [0173], lines 6-7 in Arnold).

As to claim 20, Arnold shows that the step of monitoring the performance of communication with each connected client comprises determining network transmission time and a client processing time for received transmissions (paragraph [0173]).

7. Claims 2, 3, 5, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis in view of Cohen et al. in view of Arnold et al. and in further view of Williams, Jr. (US Patent: 4,868,866).

As to claims 2 and 22, Lewis shows determining if a prior version of the formatted data object was present in the object storage pool comprising having business rules that define management of previously existing data (col. 10, lines 18-20). Lewis also shows determining a data differential between the prior version and the current state of the formatted data object comprising calculating the difference between the previous values and the new values (col. 14, lines 27-31).

Lewis in view of Cohen and in further view of Arnold does not explicitly show broadcasting the data differential on the particular broadcast data stream.

Williams shows determining a data differential between the prior version and the current state of the formatted data object and broadcasting the data differential on the particular broadcast data stream (abstract, lines 9-13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and system of Lewis in view of Cohen and in further view of Arnold by broadcasting the determined data differential on the particular broadcast data stream in order to reduce a load on the broadcast data distribution system in heavier than usual data volume situations (abstract, lines 9-10 in Williams).

As to claims 3 and 23, Lewis shows that each client has an associated user interface that dynamically configures itself to display data indicating data stream subscriptions comprising subset of the data and information that the user is subscribed for (col. 20, lines 5-21). Lewis also shows having at least one object rule comprising a business rule associated with the subscribed data stream (col. 6, lines 7-12; col. 15, lines 20-23). Lewis shows that the step of transmitting the current state of the specific data object to a set of clients comprises the steps of for each respective client subscribed to the particular input data stream, evaluating the object rules associated with the particular input data stream against the specific data object and transmitting the current state of the specific data object to the respective client in response to a positive

evaluation comprising displaying to subscribing client only that subset of the data and information that the user is entitled to retrieve (col. 20, lines 5-21; col. 6, lines 7-28).

Lewis in view of Cohen and in further view of Arnold does not show that data indicating data stream subscriptions and at least one object rule associated with the subscribed data streams are contained in a profile associated with each client.

Williams shows that data indicating data stream subscriptions and at least one object rule comprising an entitlement message associated with the subscribed data streams are contained in a profile associated with each client (col. 10, lines 60-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and system of Lewis in view of Cohen and in further view of Arnold by having data indicating data stream subscriptions and at least one object rule comprising an entitlement message associated with the subscribed data streams are contained in a profile associated with each client in order to allow changes to the information content in a profile performed without disturbing the underlying information server code (col. 9, lines 28-31 in Lewis).

As to claim 5, Lewis in view of Cohen and in further view of Arnold shows all the elements except for the step of broadcasting the current state comprising broadcasting a corresponding sequence number associated with the current state.

Williams shows broadcasting a corresponding sequence number associated with the current state comprising associating a sequence number with each broadcasted real-time message (col. 6, lines 5-8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Lewis in view of Cohen and in further view of Arnold by broadcasting a corresponding sequence number associated with the current state in order to identify and correct errors that might occur during the transmission more easily (col. 6, lines 5-8 in Williams).

8. Claims 4 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis in view of Cohen et al. in view of Arnold et al. and in further view of Wynblatt et al. (US Patent: 6,645,421 B1).

As to claims 4 and 24, Lewis shows having a plurality of Message Buses that can be deployed simultaneously.

Lewis in view of Cohen and in further view of Arnold does not show that the step of connecting to at least one broadcast data stream comprises the steps of connecting to a first data stream from a first information manager and connecting to a second broadcast data stream from a second information manager.

Wynblatt shows connecting to a first data stream from a first information manager comprising a first data stream server (11) and connecting to a second broadcast data stream comprising a second data stream server (11) from a second information manager (col. 1, lines 32-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify a method and system of Lewis in view of Cohen and in further view of Arnold by having a plurality of information managers and connecting to a first data

stream from a first information manager and connecting to a second broadcast data stream from a second information manager in order to perform a load balancing by having plural information managers receiving incoming data messages from a plurality of source systems and broadcasting data streams (col. 8, lines 54-55 in Lewis).

9. Claims 7 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis in view of Cohen et al. in view of Arnold et al. and in further view of Nguyen et al. (US Patent: 6,072,870).

As to claims 7 and 27, Lewis shows adding unique values that are used to create “primary-foreign key” relationships that interrelate pairs of data tables (col. 2, lines 28-33; col.12, lines 8-16).

Lewis in view of Cohen and in further view of Arnold does not explicitly show a translator performing the step of translating the raw data object into a raw event comprising at least one name-value pair prior to performing the steps of determining an object type of the raw data object and generating a formatted data object.

Nguyen shows an HTTPS server translating the raw data object into a raw event comprising at least one name-value pair comprising decrypting received message and parsing the message into name-value pairs (col. 62, lines 10-20) prior to performing the steps of determining an object type of the raw data object and generating a formatted data object comprising parsing the message based on determined message type and extended SET version information (col. 62, lines 20-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and system of Lewis in view of Cohen and in further view of Arnold by having the step of translating the raw data object into a raw event comprising at least one name-value pair prior to performing the steps of determining an object type of the raw data object and generating a formatted data object and having the offer processor receiving the raw event as input in order to facilitate navigation from table-to-table and maintain referential integrity among interrelated tables (col. 12, lines 12-14 in Lewis).

10. Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis in view of Cohen et al. in view of Arnold and in further view of Polcyn et al. (US Patent: 5,878,418).

As to claim 11, Lewis in view of Cohen shows connecting to a particular broadcast data stream (col. 9, lines 60-67 in Lewis).

Lewis in view of Cohen and in further view of Arnold does not show initializing the object pool cache with an initial state of data object carried on the particular broadcast data stream.

Polcyn shows initializing the object pool cache comprising a database with an initial state of data objects comprising initial states for the defined data elements (col. 9, lines 44-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Lewis in view of Cohen and in further view of Arnold

by initializing the object pool cache with an initial state of data object carried on the particular broadcast data stream in order to create database structure, including data fields, and fill the object pool cache with some initial information (col. 9, lines 49-53 in Polcyn).

As to claim 12, Lewis shows the process of initially populating the database with data objects comprising market data (col. 16, lines 28-30).

Lewis in view of Cohen and in further view of Arnold does not explicitly show the step of obtaining an initial state of data objects from the information manager generating the particular broadcast data stream.

Polcyn shows obtaining an initial state of data objects from the information manager generating the particular broadcast data stream comprising data initialization (240) setting some initial state to the defined data elements in the newly created database structure corresponding to a new application loaded wherein the initial state of data objects are obtained by the newly created database from the data initialization (240) (col. 9, lines 44-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Lewis in view of Cohen and in further view of Arnold by having the step of obtaining an initial state of data objects from the information manager generating the particular broadcast data stream in order to initialize the newly created database structure associated with a new broadcast data stream with the initial information (col. 9, lines 49-53 in Polcyn).

11. Claims 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis in view of Cohen et al. in view of Arnold in view of Polcyn et al. and in further view of Balaraman et al. (US Patent: 6,847,971 B1).

As to claim 13, Lewis in view of Cohen, Arnold, and in view of Polcyn shows all the elements except for after establishing a communication session with a particular client, delivering to the particular client a snapshot of a set of data objects in the object pool cache which are carried on broadcast data streams to which the particular client is subscribed.

Balaraman shows that after establishing a communication session with a particular client (col. 9, lines 10-15), delivering to the particular client a snapshot of a set of data objects in the object pool cache comprising a database server (202) Fig. 2 which are carried on broadcast data streams to which the particular client is subscribed (col. 6, lines 37-41; col. 9, lines 50-56; Fig. 4)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Lewis in view of Cohen, Arnold, and in view of Polcyn by delivering to the particular client a snapshot of a set of data objects in the object pool cache which are carried on broadcast data streams to which the particular client is subscribed in order to provide a subscribing client with a data that reflects the state of a set of data objects in the object pool cache at a particular point in time (col. 1, lines 57-60 in Balaraman).

As to claim 15, Lewis in view of Cohen and Arnold shows all the elements except for initializing the object pool cache with an initial state of data object carried on the new broadcast data stream, and delivering to the particular client a snapshot of a set of the data objects in the object pool cache associated with the new data stream.

Polcyn shows initializing the object pool cache comprising a database with an initial state of data objects comprising initial states for the defined data elements (col. 9, lines 44-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Lewis in view of Cohen and Arnold by initializing the object pool cache with an initial state of data object carried on the new broadcast data stream in order to create database structure, including data fields, and fill the object pool cache with some initial information (col. 9, lines 49-53 in Polcyn).

Balaraman shows delivering to the particular client a snapshot of a set of the data objects in the object pool cache comprising a database server (202) Fig. 2 associated with the new data stream (col. 6, lines 37-41; col. 9, lines 50-56; Fig. 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Lewis in view of Cohen, Arnold, and in view of Polcyn by delivering to the particular client a snapshot of a set of data objects in the object pool cache associated with the new data stream in order to provide a subscribing client with a data that reflects the state of a set of data objects in the object pool cache at a particular point in time (col. 1, lines 57-60 in Balaraman).

12. Claims 17, 18, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis in view of Cohen et al. in view of Arnold et al. and in further view of Liu et al. (US Patent: 6,839,680 B1).

As to claims 17 and 33, Lewis in view of Cohen in further view of Arnold shows all the elements except for identifying pending state events associated with a respective client which are related to a common data object, and aggregating the identified state events to thereby reduce the number of pending state events.

Liu shows identifying pending state events associated with a respective client which are related to a common data object comprising keeping track of which events have not been retrieved (col. 28 lines 56-59) wherein an event record has a user identifier (902 Fig. 9) (col. 24, lines 7-27), and aggregating the identified state events to thereby reduce the number of pending state events (col. 33, lines 4-22, Fig. 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and system of Lewis in view of Cohen and in further view of Arnold by identifying pending state events in the client event queue (2430 in Arnold) associated with a respective client which are related to a common data object, and aggregating the identified state events to thereby reduce the number of pending state events in order to allow all of the relevant information about the user's relevant information during the specified period of time to be easily accessed from a single data source (col. 33, lines 32-35 in Liu).

As to claim 18, Liu shows the identified state events are aggregated into a single state event (col. 33, lines 19-22, Fig. 2 level 0).

Conclusion

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OLEG SURVILLO whose telephone number is (571)272-9691. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 8:30am - 6:00pm; F 8:30am - 5:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Examiner: Oleg Survillo

Phone: 571-272-9691

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2142